

Re Point III

For Claim 10 it is impossible to prepare an expert opinion regarding novelty and inventive step because the claim is vague for the following reasons:

Claim 10 defines a control unit for controlling operating sequences, having a device for implementing the method as recited in Claim 8.

However, Claim 8 defines a device, not a method. It is thus unclear which method should be performed by the device defined in Claim 10.

Re Point V

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US-B1-6 543 049 (Bates, Cary Lee et al.),  
April 1st, 2003 (4/1/2003).

D2: US-A-4 866 665 (Haswell-Smith et al.),  
September 12, 1989 (9/12/1989).

2. The present application fails to meet the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT because the object of Claims 1, 8, 11 and 12 is not novel as defined in Article 33(2) PCT.

2.1 Shipping houses in general use customer management systems to manage customer information such as name, address, etc.

When a customer moves so that his address changes, a *method for adaptation of functions for controlling operating sequences* is implemented in the management system (namely all functions for which the customer address is relevant),

*the functions accessing at least one global variable of at least one program for control* (the customer

information must be used by all functions and is therefore usually in the form of a global variable) and address information being assigned to this global variable (the customer address is assigned to the global variable), this address information being located in at least one memory means (the global variable having the customer address is necessarily accommodated in a memory), this address information of the global variable being loaded by at least one load instruction out of the memory means (whenever the customer address must be printed on a page of paper, it is loaded out of the memory), and the address information of the global variable of the load instruction being replaced (the old address is replaced by the new address).

Claim 1 thus defines a method that was already being used in customer management systems each time there was an address change and this was before the priority date of the present application. The object of the claim is therefore not novel.

- 2.2 Claim 8 defines a device for performing the method as recited in Claim 1 but this is not novel in comparison with a customer management system as described in section 2.1.
- 2.3 Since the method as recited in Claim 1 is not novel, a computer program and a computer program product implementing this method are also not novel.  
The object of Claims 11 and 12 is therefore also not novel.
3. Dependent Claims 2 through 7 and 9 do not contain any features that – in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer back – meet the

requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive merit, see documents D1 and D2 and the corresponding text passages cited in the search report.

Re Section VIII

Claim 1 is defined as an address information that is assigned to a global variable. It is not clear from the wording whether this address information is the address of the variable in a memory or whether the content of the variable constitutes address information (e.g., a street name).